



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,656	03/15/2001	Torsten Mangold	1475	3419

7590 08/12/2003

Striker Striker & Stenby  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, NY 11743

EXAMINER
----------

GONZALEZ, JULIO C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/744,656

**Applicant(s)**

MANGOLD ET AL.

**Examiner**

Julio C. Gonzalez

**Art Unit**

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 21 January 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: both claims depend on canceled claims 3 and 5. Respectfully, claims 3-6 were canceled on the response sent to the Examiner on January 21, 2003. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 20, what is considered a “short-circuit bar” and a “short-circuit ring”? Is this short-circuit ring the same as the teeth forming the sensor ring as shown in figure 2? Are these devices just shape of the stator with unusual names? What are the devices short-circuiting? What the short-circuiting has to do with the cooling device?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Watanabe et al in view of Albright et al and Torok.

Watanabe discloses a generator with a riveted laminated stator 1 (see figure 1), a rotor and a cooling system in the interior of a stator 1 (see figures 3, 4). However, Watanabe et al does not disclose using a cooling system on the outside of a stator.

On the other hand, Albright et al discloses for the purpose of improving the cooling efficiency of generators, a generator 1 having a stator core 13, a cooling system having tubes 30 formed on an outer part of the stator 1. However, neither Watanabe et al nor Albright et al disclose that a rotor may be composed of laminations.

On the other hand, Torok discloses for the purpose of manufacturing a high performance electrical machine, stator 11 and rotor 12 made of layered laminations (see figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design a generator as disclosed by Watanabe et al and to modify the invention by having a cooling system outside the stator for the purpose of improving the cooling efficiency of generators as disclosed by Albright et al and to make the stator and rotor laminated for the purpose of manufacturing a high performance electrical machine as disclosed by Torok.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watabe et al, Albright et al and Torok as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takano.

The combined generator discloses all of the elements above. However, the combined generator does not disclose using a ring sensor.

On the other hand, Takano disclose for the purpose of improving the electrical connections of the armature, a sensor ring 33 (see figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined generator as disclosed above and to modify the invention by using a sensor ring for the purpose of improving the electrical connections of the armature as disclosed by Takano.

6. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watabe et al and Albright et al and Torok as applied to claims 3 and 5 above, and further in view of Oda et al.

The combined generator discloses all of the elements above. However, the combined generator does not disclose using a sealing for the cooling system.

On the other hand, Oda teaches that a paint sealing can be used for a cooling system for the purpose of avoiding leaks (column 14, lines 10-13).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined generator as disclosed above and to modify the invention by using a sealing means for the purpose of avoiding leaks as disclosed by Oda et al.

7. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watabe et al and Albright et al and Torok as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fakult et al.

The combined generator discloses all of the elements above. However, the combined generator does not disclose that the cooling tubes may be place on recesses on a part of the stator.

On the other hand, Fakult discloses for the purpose improving the performance of electrical machines, a cooling tube 242 with a knurling ends (see figure 19), which cooling tubes are inserted in the stator (see figure 11). Moreover, a short-circuit ring 124 and short-circuit bar 112 are disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined generator as disclosed above and to modify the invention by using cooling tubes for the purpose improving the performance of electrical machines as disclosed by Fakult.

8. In regards to claim(s) 23, the method of making the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore this limitation has not been given patentable weight and will not be considered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 19-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julio C. Gonzalez whose telephone number is (703) 305-1563. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8AM-5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jcg

August 8, 2003

*Thomas M. Dougherty*  
8